

Invited but unable to attend were Whitney Young of the National Urban League, and Dr. King, president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

In his telegram to Mr. Johnson, Dr. King said he was supporting the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party delegation, predominantly Negro, which is seeking to replace the all-white regular delegation and which, according to Dr. King, is already pledged to Republican nominee BARRY GOLDWATER.

The contest, Dr. King said, is a question of whether the National Democratic Party is willing to purge itself of "racist element" and present "a clear alternative to the extremist coalition of the other party."

Failure to seat the Freedom Party, Dr. King said, "can only intensify the frustration and hopelessness which has led to violent outbursts in Negro ghettos and which undermines the efforts of responsible leadership which is attempting to deal with this frustration through concrete political action."

These words indicated that should his Freedom Party fail to be seated Dr. King thought he would be unable to adhere to a call for a moratorium on demonstrations issued recently by several Negro leaders.

The White House and the Negro leaders who conferred with the President said that Mr. Johnson opened the discussion by stating flatly he would not discuss the convention or political questions.

Dr. King released copies of his telegram to reporters when he arrived in Washington later to testify before the convention's resolutions and platform committee at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

Farmer and Wilkins also appeared before the platform committee and took the opportunity to support the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

Wilkins urged the convention to enact a rule barring any State delegation which denies membership to any race or that does not subscribe to Democratic Party principles.

Farmer said that seating of the all-white regular delegation "can only strengthen the racist oligarchy there."

And he defended demonstrations and told the committee that the convention would be the scene of "direct action." Even as he spoke, 30 CORE pickets paraded outside the hotel entrance with signs proclaiming: "The day of lily-white politics is over."

Strolling in the hotel corridors was Ben C. Callon, a member of the regular Mississippi delegation which has been refused seats on the platform committee until the contest is settled. Said he:

"We simply take the position that there is no other Democratic Party in Mississippi than ours."

But the events of the day added fuel to the Mississippi contest that will come before the convention's credentials committee on Saturday in Atlantic City.

The Alabama delegation may also enter the picture. Unchallenged by a rival delegation, the Alabama delegation nevertheless could be barred by the convention's "loyalty oath." Some sources indicate that the Mississippi regulars might be seated but Alabama's delegation barred. But the intense support of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party by Negro leaders and some other State delegations may block such a compromise.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. The gentleman refers to "so-called alleged leaders." Does the gentleman refer to the Washington Post article yesterday morning that carried the picture of Roy Wilkins?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is the article. I might say about Roy Wilkins that I think he is the most respectable one of the group, and I think he is the most conservative one of the group. I do not know anything wrong with Roy Wilkins. But he was with those who went to see the President. Phillip Randolph was one and James Farmer another. I do not know of any conservatism attached to James Farmer.

CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include an article.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all of those trading and selling goods to Castro should note the danger signs of the collapse of the Cuban economy in the press reports out of Cuba the past few days.

Apparently there has been a major shakeup in the agencies of the Cuban Government dealing with economic matters. Reports indicate the economic minister and the president of the national bank have been replaced, and all foreign purchases have been stopped, at least for the present.

Regardless of the outcome of the current crisis in Cuba, it should be plain to all that this unstable Government is not a good credit risk. English companies and others engaged in trade on liberal credit terms should be aware of the risks involved.

The economic boycott of the United States, now approved by the Organization of American States, is taking its effect in Cuba. The results will become increasingly apparent in the weeks ahead.

Since the OAS has acted, and in light of the conditions inside Cuba, the United States should increase its efforts to secure better cooperation from European powers to further isolate Castro from the community of nations. Now that our past efforts are bearing such good results we should intensify our efforts to bring about the downfall of Castro and the return of freedom to Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to include at this point in the Record an article on this subject from the Washington Daily News edition today.

CUBA SUSPENDS BUYING ABROAD—NEAR COLLAPSE OF SUGAR MARKET THE REASON

(By Francis L. McCarthy)

NEW YORK, August 21.—Cuba has ordered its foreign trade representatives overseas to suspend further purchases abroad, bank sources said today.

They said that only parts and supplies needed for the sugar and nickel industries and a medical research center were excluded from the order.

The drastic cutback was interpreted to mean that Cuba has spent more than it has taken in, and now must retrench.

The order confirmed recent National Foreign Trade Council speculation based on reports from the Financial Times of London and the New York Journal of Commerce that near chaos in its own finances would force Cuba to suspend credit for foreign purchases.

TALKS END

Bank sources said the stop-buy edict issued from Havana last week also ordered an end to all negotiations not falling within the exempt categories, and suspension of all letters of credit including those for purchases already made.

The order clarified hitherto unexplained recent shifts in top Cuban economic posts. In the past 7 weeks, Cuba has ousted Regino Boti as economy minister, Marcelo Fernandez as president of the Cuban National Bank, Maj. Alberto Mora as Foreign Commerce Minister, and set up an unprecedented sugar ministry.

The new Cuban economic crisis also was assumed to be behind recent insistent peace feelers directed at the United States.

Bank sources said Cuba's present plight could be attributed to the crash of world sugar prices, compounded by amateurish buying and handling of credits abroad. Experts said waste as well as overhead was tremendous.

The sources described Cuban credit as no stronger than the sugar market—and the sugar market is in a state of collapse.

They said there was no way of totaling exactly how much Cuba owed abroad, or to whom.

The East European Satellite Common Market Bank in Moscow has reported Cuban indebtedness for goods and investment, but excluding military deliveries, to Iron Curtain countries alone at nearly \$2.5 billion.

In addition, Cuba owes millions more to Britain, Canada, France, Spain, and Japan, among others. The governments of most of these countries, including Britain and France, have underwritten private credits to Cuba.

EISENHOWER'S DEFENSE POLICIES AND McNAMARA'S MYTH

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the administration's Defense Secretary McNamara has indicated by his performance before the Democratic platform committee that he is willing to lie about the Eisenhower administration's defense policies in a shabby attempt to enhance the Democratic administration's questionable record. Falsely claiming that only now does the United States have the capacity to handle limited warfare, McNamara says that national defense under Eisenhower was based solely on massive retaliation—despite the Republican administration's skillful and proven ability to handle crises such as Lebanon and Quemoy-Matsu without using nuclear arms.

The Washington Evening Star in an August 20 editorial accuses McNamara of trying to promote a myth and states that "The election year does not give Mr. McNamara a license to kid the public." I would like to include the editorial, "McNamara's Myth," here in the Record:

McNAMARA'S MYTH

One of the irritating myths generated by the Kennedy-Johnson administrations and recited this week by Secretary of Defense McNamara should be laid to rest once and for all. This is the claim, as Mr. McNamara put it during the Democratic platform committee's TV show, that "the Defense Establish-

ment we found in 1961 was based on a strategy of massive nuclear retaliation as the answer to all military aggression."

History shows that the Eisenhower administration did not in fact base its answers to all military and political aggression on any such policy. When faced with a military crisis it did just what the Democratic administrations have done: Resorted to a limited, nonnuclear response.

President Eisenhower did not answer with massive nuclear retaliation at the time of the Lebanon crisis or the Formosa Straits bombardment. He called on portions of the 14 combat divisions, 15 carrier task groups, 7 tactical fighter wings, and 16 air transport wings available to him and solved the problems without dropping a single A-bomb.

Mr. McNamara, however, has tried many times to promote the myth that none of these nonnuclear forces existed before he came along. He has said, for instance, that "it was also evident that our position throughout the world would be greatly strengthened if we were not forced to choose between doing nothing or deliberately initiating nuclear war."

Mr. McNamara has done much to add to our conventional forces and improve the "nonnuclear option." But that option, on a lesser scale, always has existed and always has been used.

The election year does not give Mr. McNamara a license to kid the public. Neither a Secretary of Defense nor a presidential candidate should shoot from the hip on these vital matters. There is entirely too much at stake.

DIXIE PROJECT

(Mr. LLOYD (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, House passage of the Dixie project will permit the development of that fertile but arid corner of southwestern Utah known as Dixie.

Rainfall of less than 8½ inches a year has not discouraged the hardy people who settled this area some 100 years ago. But lack of natural precipitation and the vagaries of the surface streams, has curtailed the development of this region.

Although the early settlers proposed and carried out various irrigation systems, the Federal Government first took notice of the need for a large-scale effort in an official Department of Agriculture report in 1903.

The long years of preparation since then have culminated in enactment of the Dixie project.

Through development of irrigation and culinary water, control of floods, silting and erosion, stabilization of fish and wildlife habitat, development of an additional power supply, and creation of reservoirs suitable for water sports, there will be a return of \$2.20 for each \$1 of cost.

But I suggest that there will be a benefit not so easily measured in opening this land for outdoor recreation. Dixie includes and is adjacent to some of the most spectacular scenery in the country, including Canyonlands National Park, also a statutory creation of this Congress.

Although road relocation expenses are generally a part of a project cost, the State of Utah has agreed to undertake

that expenditure as a part of its highway program, removing an approximate \$2 million burden from the costs assignable to Dixie.

Of the remaining \$42,673,000, those who benefit directly will pay back to the Federal Government all but \$3,444,000.

The assignable costs are: irrigation, \$30,182,000; power, \$6,573,000; culinary water, \$2,474,000.

The Dixie project represents, in my view, a responsible advance in our civilization. It provides power necessary for the expansion of industry. It provides water for the development of land and water necessary for better living in the small cities. It has valued byproducts of flood control and recreational facilities. This is Government working at its essential best, by helping to make people more independent and more responsible and self-reliant. It is an investment which will be repaid not only in money, but in better citizens.

HARD-HITTING EDITORIALS SUPPORT MINORITY STAFFING

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of inadequate minority staffing is a problem which concerns every American who is interested in the improvement of Congress and who wants to preserve America's two-party system of government.

The Republican Party has long recognized the need for adequate minority staffing on congressional committees and in our 1964 party platform, we have included a plank calling for more equitable staffing arrangements. However, as we all know, this is not a partisan issue because both parties serve as the minority party at one time or the other. Therefore, the real issue is between a continuation of the present one-sided control of committee staffs and a more effective system which would provide for a presentation of all sides of the opinion on legislation.

A few weeks ago, I included in the Record a speech by William Jackson, president of Investor's League, Inc., dealing with the problem of minority staffing. Today, I would like to call your attention to five editorials which were broadcast on the Corinthian Broadcasting Corp.'s five television stations last year. These stations are located in key western and midwestern cities. They are KHOU-TV, Houston; KOTV, Tulsa; KXTV, Sacramento; WANE-TV, Fort Wayne; and WISH-TV, Indianapolis.

I think that these editorials eloquently express the sentiment of millions of Americans who are interested in improving our Congress, and I commend them to your attention:

KHOU-TV 11—BROADCAST EDITORIAL ON COMMITTEE STAFFING

At the age of 73, most folks figure to be retired and pretty inactive concerning work and politics.

Well, today, former President Eisenhower

is 73, but far from inactive. One project in which he is engaged merits special attention right now, while Congress is in what may be its longest session in history, the fight to correct a serious fault in the way Congress conducts its business.

This fault is in committee staffing, the way Congress puts together the myriad staffs to do the legwork which produces almost all Federal laws. A recent study of such groups—a study, by the way, endorsed by leaders of both political parties—shows that these legmen represent the majority party by ratios as high as 12 to 1.

What this amounts to is this. The public, in electing its Members of Congress, demonstrates that it wants a reasonably balanced, two-party government—but it isn't getting it where it counts, for under the present system a simple party majority produces a staff working almost entirely for the majority. Yet, in committees—even more than in the House of Congress—the key role of the minority is to act as watchdog against mistakes—the very essence of the value of two-party government.

Former President Eisenhower, at 73, is urging the public to oppose this system, regardless of which party is in control of Congress. We endorse his view, and suggest that voters who want more protection against mistakes in Congress let their feelings be known to their men in Washington.

KOTV-6 EDITORIAL ON MINORITY STAFFS

This democracy of ours, which even its founders called "a noble experiment," was built on a system of checks and balances, and presupposed a two-party government to make it work. It needs two-party government in order to survive. Yet in the very heart of this democracy, in the committee rooms of Congress, one-party rule prevails. Most of the work of Congress is done in committee, before legislation ever reaches the floor, but the minority party is sorely handicapped by a lack of committee staffs. It is the staff, composed of highly competent men, who do the research and write the reports of bills and investigations. In today's complex Government, Congressmen and Senators must rely heavily on staff members to keep them informed. The minority party has been severely shortened on committee staff members, yet on many of the committees, the minority has no staff at all, and a continuing fight by a small group to increase the ratio has met with little success. The majority jealously guards its control of committees and staffs. This is a problem that should concern every thinking American, for it is not merely a matter of party prestige. Either party can be a minority at one time or another, and to deny the minority access to adequate representation on committee staffs is to defeat the purpose of representative government. Minority members cannot function responsibly in examining, investigating, and presenting articulate opposition to questions under consideration, unless they are given the committee staffs to do so.

The management of KOTV feels that increased minority staffing of congressional committees is vital to the preservation of truly representative government. If you agree, make your voice heard by writing to your Representatives in Washington. Even the most powerful majority cannot wield unfair power without the consent of the people.

KXTV-10 BROADCAST EDITORIAL ON CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE STAFFS

Yesterday we commented on the problem of minority staffing problems in Congress—and how the majority party—whether the majority is Democrat or Republican—dominates the professional staffs of congressional committees. Since the problem is so com-